



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the risk of loss which results from the use of seed which is mixed with seeds of the dodder.

This I consider as a remarkable proof of the necessity of obtaining clean seed rather than cheap, and deserves in my opinion to be made generally known throughout Ireland by means of the Penny Journal. I conclude by saying to all cultivators of flax, When buying your seed, always ask for that from America, and do not be tempted by the cheaper but dirty seed from Russia, as by doing this you will avoid the most destructive weed to which the crop is liable.

C. C. B.

## ORIGIN AND MEANINGS OF IRISH FAMILY NAMES.

BY JOHN O'DONOVAN.

First Article.

It has for a long time appeared to me a desirable object, as regards the history of Ireland and the information of the Irish people, to communicate to the public a correct account of the origin and signification of the proper names, tribe names, and surnames of the people of Ireland; more especially as some of the popular writers of the last century have misled them generally into the most erroneous notions with regard to these classes of names. The errors of these writers have not only been adopted by the usually shallow compilers of county surveys, county histories, and other topographical works down to the present time, but also to some extent by writers of a higher order and greater learning and research, as Lanigan and Moore. Indeed, strange as the fact may seem, it is nevertheless unquestionable that there are very few in the country whose ideas upon this subject are consonant with the truth; and hence, upon most occasions on which an Irishman adopts an anglicised form of his Christian name and surname, the effect of the alteration is such as completely to conceal, and not unfrequently to misrepresent, their original orthography and meaning. On this account it becomes unavoidably necessary for me, before I enter upon the series of articles which I propose furnishing on this subject, to exhibit and expose the ignorance of those writers to whom I have alluded, and whose theories have produced so erroneous an impression upon the minds of the Irish people; and to this object I purpose to devote the present introductory paper.

The fallacies which I have to expose were unknown to the Irish people until towards the close of the last century: the writers of an earlier period having been too well informed to lead their readers into error. But their works being for the most part in a dead language, and very rarely to be met with, they ceased to have an influence on the public mind, and left the way open for a new race of writers, very ignorant of the ancient language and history of Ireland, to impose their crude theories upon the uninstructed reader. A society of such persons, of whom General Vallancey, Mr Beauford,\* and Dr Ledwich, were the most active, was formed for the purpose of giving to the public a series of essays on the antiquities, ancient literature, and topography of Ireland; and the result of their joint labours made its appearance in a work published periodically under the title of "*Collectanea de Rebus Hibernicis*," and since popularly called Vallancey's *Collectanea*. These gentlemen, however, after a time found that their systems had nothing in common, each considering the other as insufficiently informed on the subjects treated of, and I think, with justice; for, as I trust I shall be able to show on a future occasion, all were alike ignorant of the matters they professed perfectly to understand. But though the labours of these gentlemen contributed generally to the propagation of erroneous theories on the subject, it was a work of Mr Beauford's, published in No. 11 of the *Collectanea*, which, treating more immediately of this subject, has had the greatest influence on the popular mind; an influence less owing to any celebrity attached to his own name than to that of Vallancey, whose sanction and approbation this work is generally supposed to have received. With this writer originated the novel theory that the names of tribes and families in Ireland, as usual among the Saxons and Normans, were derived from earlier appellations of the territories and localities which they occupied. To establish this hypothesis he adopts a process of etymological investigation unparalleled in the annals of

antiquarian research. In the first place, he takes the liberty of dividing the words into as many parts as he thinks proper; secondly, he makes such changes in the vocables thus obtained as he finds convenient to his purpose; thirdly, he gives each of these words new meanings of his own; and lastly, he places the tribes whose names he thus explains in localities which many of them never occupied.

As the errors of this writer, though so long before the public, have never been sufficiently exposed, I shall here undertake the task, by the exhibition of a few examples of his process of investigation, taken without selection, and given as a fair specimen of the whole. It will be necessary for me, however, in fairness, to quote in the first instance the author's own account of the theory which he has put forward to account, in his novel manner, for the origin of the names of men and tribes in Ireland.

"On the increase of population and the introduction of agriculture, these wandering tribes were under the necessity of confining themselves to certain permanent districts; which districts were generally denominated either from their situation or quality of the soil, and from which also the inhabitants obtained their collective appellation; whence, in the most ancient Irish poems and histories, we frequently find *clan* and *sliocht* added to the name of the country, to signify the inhabitants; as *clan Cuilean*, *sliocht Breoghain*, and *sliocht Gae*; wherefore the children and race of any division were the invariable names by which the ancient Hibernian sept were distinguished from the remotest antiquity, and not, as frequently asserted, the children and descendants of their respective leaders."

Again, "The chiefs of every district were elected from the elder branches of the dynasts; and the kings of the principalities from the senior chief of the subordinate districts, who on their advancement to the dignity obtained the name of the district or clan over which they presided; it being an universal custom amongst all the Celtic tribes to denominate the noblesse, with their other appellations, from the place of their residence; a custom in some measure yet retained in the Highlands of Scotland. The variety of names used by the ancient Irish have occasioned great confusion in their history; for before the tenth century surnames were not hereditary, and prior to the establishment of the Christian religion in this country no person was distinguished by one permanent nomination. It is true, during their pagan state every child at his birth received a name generally from some imaginary divinity under whose protection he was supposed to be; but this name was seldom retained longer than the state of infancy, from which period it was generally changed for others arising from some perfection or imperfection of the body, the disposition and qualities of the mind, achievements in war or the chase, the place of birth, residence, &c. so that it frequently happened that the same person was distinguished by several appellations. Our ancient historians, not properly attending to this, have committed great errors in relating the transactions of early periods, by asserting the same action to be performed by several different people, which in reality was performed by one only, thereby throwing their history and antiquities into too distant a period. A similar error has also been committed by not considering the dignitary names of the chiefs, who on their election to the government constantly obtained the name appertaining to the clan over whom they presided, or rather that of the district. These dignitary names becoming in the tenth century hereditary and family distinctions, created new difficulties to genealogists of latter ages."—*Collectanea*, vol. iii, p. 257.

Now, it will be very easy to prove that these assertions are wholly erroneous, and are mere conjectures, unsupported either by history or etymology. In the first place, the three instances above given to show that the words *clan* and *sliocht* were prefixed to the names of territories among the Irish, instead of supporting the author's assumption, go to prove the very contrary, for in the first two instances the names adduced are not names of territories, but of men; and with regard to the third instance, there was no such name among the ancient Irish, and it is a pure fabrication of Beauford's own imagination! As for his assertion that in the time of paganism every child at his birth received a name generally from some imaginary divinity under whose protection he was supposed to be, it is another pure fabrication; there is no authority in any of our ancient documents that men were called after their pagan deities, except in three instances, in the darkest period of Irish history; and even from these it does not appear that

\* Let not the reader confound this Beauford with the author of the ecclesiastical map of Ireland, for the latter was Dr Beaufort, and his works are distinguished for their accuracy.

such names were given immediately after the birth of the individuals referred to, but that they assumed them after having arrived at the age of maturity. These instances are to be met with in ancient Irish MSS. concerning the history of the Tuatha De Dananns, a colony said to have preceded the Scoti in Ireland, at a period now generally believed to be beyond the reach of authentic history; but granting that what has been handed down to us concerning this colony is authentic, it does not follow from any thing stated that even among them every child at his birth received a name from a divinity under whose protection he was placed; for the sum of what has been handed down to us on this subject is, that on the arrival of the Scotie or Milesian colony in Ireland the Tuatha De Dananns were governed by three kings, who were distinguished by surnames derived from the names of the gods whom they worshipped. Thus, one of those kings, whose real name was *Eochy*, was, it is said, usually styled *Mac Greine*, because he worshipped the sun; the second, whose proper name was *Eathur*, was called *Mac Cuill*, because he worshipped the hazel tree, for I suppose men generally lived on nuts in his time; and the third, whose proper name was *Teathur*, was called *Mac Ceachta*, i.e. son of the plough, for he worshipped that useful implement as his god! We have no instance of men having been named after pagan deities but these three, and I venture to say that they are not sufficient to establish Beauford's hypothesis. But a stronger argument than this can be urged against his theory, namely, that among all the pagan names of men which have been preserved by our authentic annalists, not one appears to be called after a pagan deity; and if it had been a general custom to call children after such deities, it might be expected that at least a few of them would have been transmitted. Since, then, they have not been transmitted, how, I would ask, did Mr Beauford discover that such a custom had ever existed? It is true that after the establishment of Christianity in the fifth century, the descendants of the pagan Irish who entered into holy orders, or into the monastic state, had their pagan names sometimes changed, as we learn from the lives of the saints of the primitive Irish church, but no documents now remain to prove, or even suggest, that such a change had been made previous to the introduction of Christianity. It is undeniable that cognomens, epithets, or sobriquets, were frequently added to the first name from some warlike exploit, or from some perfection or imperfection of body, colour of hair, or disposition of mind; but this continued to be the custom in Christian times, and still continues so, but no authority has been discovered even to suggest that any change of the original pagan name had occurred previous to the introduction of Christianity; and we find that even long after that period many distinguished Irish bishops, abbots, and other ecclesiastics, bore the names of their pagan ancestors.

It is also a groundless assumption that the chief changed his name for that of the territory after his election to the government, or that the names of either the clan or district became surnames or family names in the tenth century. Can any one believe that Brian was the name of the territory of the O'Briens before the establishment of the name O'Brien? Was Donnell the name of the territory of the O'Donnells previous to the tenth century? Was Niall the name of the principality of the O'Neills?

So much then for Mr Beauford's general theory as put forward in the introduction to his work. I shall now proceed to show the equal fallacy of the etymological processes by which he attempts to sustain his theoretical assumptions in the work itself; namely, that the names of Irish tribes and families were derived from the situations and natural features of the territories they inhabited.

1. "CLANN CUILEAN, or the race or children of the corner of the water; called also *Hy na mor*, or the district of the sea; the chiefs of which were denominated *Mac na mor aois*, the sons of the elders of the sea, by contraction *Macnamara*," &c.

Now, what will be thought of all this etymological induction, when it can be proved from history that *clann Cuileain* signifies the race of *Cullen*?

The *Cuilean* or *Cullen* from whom this tribe took their name is found in the pedigree of Mac Namara, within the authentic period of Irish history, for he flourished in the eighth century, a period to which our authentic annals reach with perfect historical certainty. Let us then see how this meaning "children of the corner of the water" is obtained from the compound *clann Cuileain*. Apparently by a very simple pro-

cess, thus: *clann* means descendants, *cuil* means corner, and *ean* water; but regular as this process appears, it is nevertheless utterly fallacious, for the word *clann* means children or descendants relatively to an ancestor, not to a locality; and though the name *Cuileain* (now anglicised *Cullen* or *Collins*) when cut in two, would apparently make the words *cuil* and *ean*, still the word is not compounded of *cuil*, a corner, and *ean*, water, for the first syllable is short, and the last syllable is a diminutive termination of the same power with the Latin *ulus*, as in the compounds *campulus*, *colliculus*, *catulus*; and the word *cuilean*, whether taken as a common noun substantive or as a proper name, is synonymous with the Latin *catulus*, or *Ca-tullus*.

The next assertion above made, that *clann Cuileain* was also called *Hy na mor*, is untrue, for the name *Hy na mor* had never any existence except in Mr Beauford's fancy; and even if it had, the meaning given for it would not be correct, for *hy* does not properly mean district, nor does *mor* mean sea. The assertion that the chiefs of *clann Cuileain* were called *Mac na mor aois* is also untrue, for the name was never so written by any one except Mr Beauford. They were uniformly called *Mic Conmara*, as being the descendants of *Cu-mara*, who was chief of the *clann Cuileain* in the tenth century; and the name *Cumara*, signifying *hero of the sea*, was first given to a chief of this family, from his being an expert seaman, not from his dwelling on the sea, for the *clann Cuileain* or *Mac Namaras* were not located on the sea, or near the sea, but in an inland territory in the south-east of the county of Clare.

2. "CINEAL EOGHEAN, or *Cean all Eoghain*, from *cean* *thuaht all Eogh-an*, pronounced Connal Owen, or the principal division of the northern county of the Oll or Bolgae, an ancient district in the province of Ulster, comprehending originally the present counties of Tyrone, Armagh, Donegal, and part of the county of Derry, being the ancient divisions of Eirgal or Orgall," &c.

Here the name *Cineal Eoghain*, which had been translated *genus Eoghain*, i.e., race or progeny of *Eoghain*, by all the early Irish writers, is made to signify the principal division of the northern county of the Oll or Bolgae. Let us examine how this interpretation has been wrested from *Cineal Eoghain*. In the first place, he spells the name incorrectly, though we cannot see that he gains any point by doing so; next he takes asunder what he conceives to be its component parts, first metamorphosing the word *Cineal*, which is cognate with the Latin *genus* and the English *kind*, *kindred*, into *Cean all*, which he made to signify "principal division," and resolving *Eoghain*, a man's name, into *Eogh-an*, to make it signify I know not what; but as the four vocables thus obtained would not answer his purpose, he took the liberty of adding one more of his own coining, thus making five distinct words of the two original ones. But even allowing that these five vocables are legitimately obtained from the two original ones, I have still a further objection to them, for they do not grammatically coalesce, or bear the meaning he affixes to them, as there is no word among the five to express *principal division* or *county*. And granting further that the five words thus formed could really bear the signification he gives them, it would not follow that the name *Cineal Eoghain* is so compounded, while in opposition to the testimony of all authentic history; and we have the testimony of all the authentic Irish annals, the lives of the Irish apostle, and of the most ancient genealogical books, to prove that the great northern race called *Cineal Eoghain* took that appellation from their great ancestor *Eoghain* (the son of Niall of the Nine Hostages), who was contemporary with St Patrick, as did a neighbouring race that of *Cineal Conaill*, from *Eoghain's* brother, *Conall Gulban*.

But the supporters of Mr Beauford's system may say that although it may be true that the *Cineal Eoghain* took their appellation from their ancestor *Eoghain*, still that this *EOGHAIN* may have taken his name from the territory over which he ruled. I answer, that this does not bear even the semblance of probability, for we have the authority of Cormac's Glossary for asserting that the proper name *Eoghain* (still used as a man's name in every part of Ireland, and anglicised *Owen* and *Eugene*) was understood by the ancient Irish literati to signify the *good offspring*, or the *goodly born*, and this looks much more probable than the signification which Mr Beauford wrings from it, for the Irish had many other names similarly compounded, as *Finghin* (now Florence), meaning the fair offspring; *Coemhghin* (now Kevin), the beautiful offspring, &c. Thus it appears that Beauford's derivation of the tribe name of *Cineal Eoghain* is a mere etymological

phantasy, unsupported by history or etymology. I have also to mention that the extent he gives to the territory of this tribe is too great, for it never comprised the one-fourth part of the present county of Donegal, or any part of Armagh.

But I am exceeding the space allowed me for this article, and must defer the remaining examples till next number.

### LETHE: AN ALLEGORY.

BY J. U. U.

Has it e'er crossed thy fancy to explore  
The mystery of that old forgetful river  
In which the Shade, permitted to renew  
Its servitude to clay, went down to drink  
Oblivion of itself and all it was:  
A dread completion of the work of Death!

Now lend a patient hearing, and I'll tell thee  
—Thou wilt receive it as a wayward dream—  
The course of this old river. Know it glides  
Beneath thy steps, with lapse invisible,  
For but by glimpses mortals may behold it;  
And these seem far too glorious for one thought  
Of dull oblivion ever to intrude  
On the rapt vision. Not a shadow there  
From gloomy Hades clouds the living light  
That glances gaily down the rippling stream.  
But past description's power, 'tis loud and bright  
With trumpet voices, and with silken sails  
Full-blown with Fortune's breath; while from the bank  
Hope lifts her siren strain, and bids them speed  
For ever on to happy isles afar.  
And every ripple teems with springing thoughts—  
In one sense faithful to the Samian's creed—  
A constant iteration of old fancies  
As if the wise and fools of time came back  
With their old dreams: forgetful of experience.  
There system swells on system, bubbles gay,  
Conventions, empires, powers, authorities,  
Song's intellectual fabric, pictures, modes,  
Those myriad lights, the glory and the glitter  
Which make that current gaily beautiful.  
And so it rolls, in its magnificence  
Tumbling and sparkling up into the sun  
Like an eternal thing: buoyant and bright  
Beneath the airs of Heaven that murmur mirth  
And hope, and life, and pauseless interest.  
While on its living course no spot is seen  
That is not far too bright and glorious  
For the approach of grim decay, or that  
More mighty and more terrible shadow Death  
To find a cave to lurk in. . . . .

. . . . . Thou wilt say,  
This is not Lethe, whose dull waters glide  
Sunless among the silent fields of death,  
Oblivion's formless valley. Yet attend—  
Mark well the course of each bright-crested wave:—  
As it rolls by, the gallant barks it bore  
Are vanished, and have left no trace, as if  
They never had existence. Though for ever  
New shadows fast emerge into the Sun  
(So like the last, that scarce one notes the change),  
And take a look of immortality,  
Incredulous of the Past, blind to the Future;  
Not knowing whence they come, from what they are,  
Or whither tend. Alas, the stream  
With all that went before, is lost below  
In dim Oblivion's world: It were a dream  
Most fleeting and fantastic, were there not  
A chain of awful consequence that binds  
What has been, with what must be. Death and Life,  
The Past, the Present, and the Future, are  
But names bestowed on one perpetual stream,  
In different provinces beneath the Crown  
Of Him who is the source from whence all comes  
And to whom all returns—we see no more  
But as the gazer from some narrow bridge  
Looks down upon the waters, when beneath  
They come from far, and so pass, and are gone.

THE DOMESTIC MAN.—There is no being of the masculine gender whom "the sex" so heartily despise as the domestic man. He is an anomaly—a sort of half-way house between the sexes—a concentration of weaknesses—a poor dribble of humanity—a vile caudle-drinker—an auditor of laundress's bills—an inquisitor of the nursery—a fellow that likes his bed warmed, and takes note of the decay of carpets—a reader of works on "cookery" and a "treatise on teething"—a pill bolter—a man that buys his wife's gowns and his children's dresses—a scolder of maid-servants—a frequenter of the kitchen—a person who can tell you the price of treacle, and how long a poor should last—a gazer at butchers' windows—a consumer of ginger wine—a slop eater—a market visitor—a tea maker—Faugh! He looks like the aborigine of a bed-room. He is lean and bilious—delights in black gaiters and a brown greatcoat. He gives his little bandy-legged child a walk in the Park, where he is taken for a brother of one of the nursery maids in delicate health. He entertains his visitors with his discoveries of the tricks of bakers and the machinations of grocers—*ennuis* them to death with long stories about bad bread, and "coffee without adulteration." He always knows what is to be for dinner, what remains in the larder—and employs his gigantic intellect in considering the best mode of cooking it. He is naturally fretful and peevish, and in cold weather has a helplessness of aspect peculiar to himself. These men never look like Englishmen. They never acquire that manly bluff appearance which is the character of our nation. God knows what is the matter with them, but they always seem out of sorts. Their features are sharp—their voices are effeminate, and they are nearly all of them "troubled with colds." The business of life with them is to regulate the affairs of housekeeping—their tastes, habits, thoughts, and rivalries, are womanish. Their conversation is about "poor Mrs" this, and "poor Lady" that—antiquated matrons, with whom they occasionally compare notes in matters of condolence—yet who have enough of the spirit of their sex in them to despise their male coadjutor, and in their souls they think "poor Mr" so-and-so the greatest bore alive. They are always complaining; if not positively unwell themselves—a case of rare occurrence—some of their family is sure to be so—or, if all that should fail, then, at least, a dish has been broken, and there is always a number of standing grievances ready to be produced when occasion requires. "Well, heaven help them!" as Shakspeare says, "for they are sad fools." They live a long time, these fellows, but they die at last—all the pills and possets in the world will not avert death. The passenger who sees the hearse and mutes, thinks some rational being has died—the stranger, who reads the tombstone, thinks that a *man* moulders below. But are they deceived? We think so.—COURT GAZETTE.

PETRARCH'S OPINION OF MONEY.—He who expends it properly, is its master; he who lays it up, its keeper; he who loves it, a fool; he who fears it, a slave; and he who adores it, an idolator.

The whole of human virtue may be reduced to speaking the truth always, and doing good to others.

Many an acknowledged truth was once a controverted dogma; the basis of every science has been considered a fundamental error.

Truth is the most compendious wisdom, and an excellent instrument for the speedy dispatch of business. It creates confidence in those we have to deal with, saves the labour of many inquiries, and brings things to issue in a few words.—*Spectator*.

Let us hope the best rather than fear the worst, and believe that there never was a right thing done, or a wise one spoken in vain, although the fruit of them may not spring up in the place designated, or at the time expected.

George II., being informed that an impudent printer was to be punished for having published a spurious King's speech, replied, that he hoped the punishment would be of the mildest sort, because he had read both, and as far as he *understood* either of them, he liked the spurious speech better than his own.

Printed and published very Saturday by GUNN and CAMERON, at the Office of the General Advertiser, No. 6, Church Lane, College Green, Dublin.—Agents:—R. GROOMBRIDGE, Panyer Alley, Paternoster Row, London; SIMMS and DINHAM, Exchange Street, Manchester; C. DAVIES, North John Street, Liverpool; SLOcombe & SIMMS, Leeds; JOHN MENZIES, Prince's Street, Edinburgh; & DAVID ROBERTSON, Trongate, Glasgow.